



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,641	08/07/2006	Laurens Last	903-191 PCT/US	7920

23869 7590 12/27/2010
HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 JERICHO TURNPIKE
SYOSSET, NY 11791

EXAMINER

ALLEN, JEFFREY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3781

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/27/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/585,641	Applicant(s) LAST, LAURENS	
	Examiner JEFFREY ALLEN	Art Unit 3781	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

10585641 DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-9 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uematsu (U.S. Patent No. 6,142,341) in view of Caligari Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 3,198,686) and JUD (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0094415).

3. Regarding claims 1, 3 and 4, Uematsu discloses a spout (10) designed to be sealed on a bag (15) comprising a plastic body which forms a channel that contents of the bag may pass through, wherein the spout has sealing sides (12) situated opposite each other, each sealing side having a sealing surface (12a) which is substantially flat and free from ribs and adapted to achieve a sealed connection with the bag (col. 4, lines 28-30).

4. Uematsu fails to disclose wherein each sealing surface has a rough surface structure, wherein the surface roughness value lies between 20 and 40 in accordance with VDI Richtlinie 3400.

5. Caligari teaches that it is known in the art to manufacture a plastic sealing surface with a rough structure in order to improve adhesive bonding (col. 1, lines 60-63).

Art Unit: 3781

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have manufactured the sealing surface of Uematsu to be rough, as taught by Caligari, in order to improve the seal between the spout and the bag.

7. JUD teaches that it is known in the art to manufacture a sealing surface with a roughness value which lies between 26 and 34 in accordance with VDI Richtlinie 3400 (par. 9).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have manufactured the modified sealing surface of Uematsu to have the roughness taught by JUD so that the spout would meet VDI Richtlinie 3400 standards and since such a modification would have been a change in size of an existing component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

9. Regarding claims 5-8, the modified spout of Uematsu teaches wherein the body has a transverse wall (Uematsu, 11) with an opening in it, a tubular element (Uematsu, 20) extending from the side of the transverse side opposite the sealing surfaces and wherein the body has sealing walls projecting at an angle from the transverse wall that are symmetrical, the sealing surfaces of the spout forming the outside of the sealing walls. The sealing walls are at the greatest distance from each other at a central area and are connected to each other at their ends (Uematsu, Fig. 3).

10. Regarding claim 9, the modified spout of Uematsu teaches a bag having film walls provided with a spout that is sealed by a sealing technique (Uematsu, col. 4, lines 28-30).

Art Unit: 3781

11. Regarding claim 30, the modified spout of Uematsu teaches wherein the sealing surfaces have a rough structure over the entire sealing side.

12. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references applied above and further in view of Araki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,241,122).

13. The modified spout of Uematsu teaches all the claimed limitations as shown above but fails to teach wherein the tubular element is provided with a screw thread for a screw cap.

14. Araki teaches that it is known in the art to manufacture a spout for a bag wherein a tubular element on the spout has a screw thread (12) for a screw cap (2).

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have manufactured the modified spout of Uematsu with a screw thread and screw cap, as taught by Araki, since such a modification would be a simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain a predictable result.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY ALLEN whose telephone number is (571)270-

Art Unit: 3781

7426. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 AM TO 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on (571)272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 3781

/Anthony Stashick/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3781